



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/516,402	03/01/2000	Neta Amit	MSI-2692US	2983
22801 7590 08/11/2009 LEE & HAYES, PLLC 601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 1400 SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J				
ART UNIT 2437		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 08/11/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/516,402

Applicant(s)

AMIT ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL PYZOCHA

Art Unit

2437

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1-10 and 22 have been considered. Claims 11-21 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/10/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (US 6601171) in view of Murakami (US5845082) and further in view of Ault et al. (US 5974566).

As per claim 1, Carter et al. discloses sending a request for network account credentials from an originating account to complete a job, at a dispatch associated with a published object, the request directed to the published object associated with the dispatch includes identification of an unpublished object associated with the originating

account (see column 8 lines 30-43), the published object is accessible by an account without prior identification of the published object and the unpublished object is accessible by the account when the account is previously informed about the identification of the unpublished object (see column 8 lines 30-57 and column 9 lines 1-10); authenticating the originating account at the dispatch (see column 7 line 38 through column 8 line 16); determining credentials for a network account to send to the originating account, and upon authenticating the originating account, sending an emblem that includes an object and the credentials, for a network account to the originating account, the emblem sent to the unpublished object associated with the originating account and having the identification as included with the request (see column 8 lines 58-67).

Carter et al. fails explicitly to disclose that the request for credentials is for use in completing an assigned job.

However, Murakami teaches requesting and receiving credentials (a token) in order to complete an assigned job (see column 1 lines 59-67).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to request credentials to complete an assigned job in the Carter et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to prevent the same resource from being used by a plurality of clients (see Murakami column 1 lines 59-67).

The modified Carter et al. and Murakami system discloses using credentials to complete a job, but fails to explicitly disclose using the account credentials to impersonate the network account to complete the assigned job.

However, Ault et al. teaches using credentials to impersonate an account to complete a job (see column 10 lines 3-21).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the credentials of the modified Carter et al. and Murakami system to impersonate an account to complete an assigned job.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for performance enhancements (see Ault et al. column 10 lines 3-21).

As per claim 2, the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system discloses the request and returned password (i.e. emblem) are unencrypted (see Carter et al. column 8 lines 58-67).

As per claims 3 and 4, Examiner takes official notice that message queues and files are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize message queues or files in order to store or transport data. It is noted that since Applicant has not traversed the Official Notice the above statements (regarding claims 3 and 4) are taken as admitted prior art (See MPEP 2144.03).

As per claim 5, the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system discloses that the emblem comprises a token (see Murakami column 1 lines 59-67).

As per claim 8, the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system discloses the network account for which the emblem is sent from the dispatch to the originating account comprises an agent account of an agent (see Carter et al. column 9 lines 1-10).

As per claim 9, the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system discloses proxy logging on to an agent and remoting an agent account to the originating account upon proxy log on to the agent, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the agent account (see Ault et al. column 1 line 51 through column 2 line 20).

As per claim 22, the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system discloses the dispatch is a device within a network that sends network account credentials to the originating account (see Carter et al. column 8 lines 58-67).

5. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kao et al. (US 7451147).

As per claim 6, the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system fails to disclose the network account for which the emblem is sent from to dispatch to the originating account comprises a batch account of the dispatch.

However, Kao et al. teaches such a batch account (see Kao et al. column 3 lines 33-50).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a batch account in the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to have all the information in a central location (see Kao et al. column 3 lines 33-50).

As per claim 7, the modified Carter et al., Murakami, Ault et al. and Kao et al. system discloses, sending an emblem for the network account to the originating account comprises remoting a batch account to the originating account, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the batch account (see Kao et al. column 3 lines 33-50).

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Patel et al. (US 6438690).

As per claim 10, the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system fails to disclose the emblem expiring and renewing the about to expire emblem.

However, Patel et al. teaches renewing expired emblems (see column 8 lines 23-26).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to renew about to expire emblems in the modified Carter et al., Murakami and Ault et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user a convenient method for reminding and renewing information (see Patel et al. column 8 lines 23-26).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
8. Applicant's arguments (see pages 12-14) fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOSHA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Pyzocha/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437